AORISTIC PRESENT, "SUBJUNCTIVE" AND CONVERTERS IN MODERN GREEK*

By NIMROD BARRI

SUMMARY

There is much talk in Modern Greek Grammar about a subjunctive because forms like $\chi \acute{a}\sigma \omega$, when preceded by $\nu \acute{a}$, have functions reminiscent of the subjunctive in Ancient Greek. By extrapolation, $\chi \acute{a}\nu \omega$ is said to serve as subjunctive too, beside its indicative function, because with $\nu \acute{a}$ it too behaves like a subjunctive. Since many grammarians tend to disrespect "particles," there has been born a belief that $\chi \acute{a}\sigma \omega$ and $\chi \acute{a}\nu \omega$ without $\nu \acute{a}$ somehow contain in themselves the essence of "subjunctiveness," although with $\nu \acute{a}$ they make even better subjunctives.

More logical, even if less morphologic, is to admit that $\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ without $\nu\acute{\alpha}$ is indicative, hence it is $\nu\acute{\alpha}$ that is the subjunctive formant. A further step: $\nu\acute{\alpha}$ $\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ (subjunctive mood) minus $\nu\acute{\alpha}$ (subjunctive formant) is equal to $\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ (indicative). Thus $\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ is an aoristic present indicative (regularly negated by $\delta\acute{\epsilon}(\nu)$ when not accompanied by $\nu\acute{\alpha}$ or $\mathring{\alpha}\varsigma$, which demand $\mu\acute{\eta}(\nu)$).

Now this aoristic present $\chi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ is practically always preceded by preparticles of two distinct groups: generally speaking, in main clauses it combines with $\vartheta \acute{\alpha}$, $\nu \acute{\alpha}$ or $\ddot{\alpha} \varsigma$ to make future tense, volitive and exhortative mood respectively; in dependent clauses it is preceded by one of a list of "converters" like $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$, $\ddot{\sigma} \tau \alpha \nu$, $\ddot{\sigma} \pi \sigma \iota \sigma \varsigma$, $\dot{\alpha} \varphi \sigma \sigma$ etc. as well as $\nu \acute{\alpha}$ (subordinator) and $\ddot{\alpha} \varsigma$ (concessive). All these subordinate the whole clause, but prefer to be glued to the verb like true modal formants, as though they were a verbal, not a syntactic, category.

Typologically, this way of constructing a "conditional verb

form" ἄν χάσω or "temporal verb form" ὅταν χάσω makes the Modern Greek verb, at least in part, an agglutinative form.

Professor H. J. Polotsky was my first teacher of Modern Greek. On this special occasion I shall try to extend some of his ideas, mainly formulated for Egyptian and Coptic, to that non-oriental language.

1. Morphological Subjunctive in Greek

Is there a subjunctive mood in Modern Greek? And if there is, what is its exact form? These questions seem to haunt descriptions of the verb in the modern language to this day. To my knowledge, no satisfactory answers have yet been put forth. We find the question already in Andriotis, 1934 and a quick positive answer by Dzardzanos in the same year. The essentials of this answer were condensed in Dzardzanos, 1946 into a footnote, which is better translated here in full:

The subjunctive in the grammatical sense, i.e. formally and phonetically, has by now, in the present tense (both active and middle or passive) fallen together with the indicative (γράφω, γράφεις, γράφει etc., νά γράφω, νά γράφης, νά γράφη etc., λούζομαι, λούζεσαι, λούζεται etc., νά λούζωμαι, νά λούζεσαι, νά λούζεται etc.). This leads many people to think that in the Modern Greek language there exists no separate mood to be called subjunctive. Yet in the a or ist, both active and middle or passive, the subjunctive has always preserved and preserves in pure form to this day all its specific marks (cf. ἔγραψα, -ες, -ε etc., γράψω, -ης, -η etc. — ντύθηκα, -ες, -ε etc., ντυθῶ, -ŋs, -ŋ etc.). Moreover, the fact that the two moods, i.e. indicative and subjunctive, have not, syntactically and semantically, fallen together, is clearly shown, among other things, by the different use of the negation in each mood. Cf. Δέ γράφεις ίσια — μή γράφης στραβά. Δέν έγραψες τίποτε — μή γράψης τίποτε [. .] (Dzardzanos, 1946:280, n.).

Practically all the grammars (see below, § 5) have followed this double argument—the existence of a special agrist subjunctive form

and the specialized subjunctive negation—and on its force have posited a separate present subjunctive, identical in form with the indicative: $\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ = $(\nu\acute{\alpha})$ $\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$. The dubious standing of $\nu\acute{\alpha}$ signalled by the brackets is important: knowledge of the historical subjunctive inflection as well as a wish to see all verbal categories expressed by proper suffixes of the finite verb-word have helped in creating and sustaining an otherwise impossible myth: the myth of the subjunctive word-form of the type $\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$.

The reckoning goes as follows: χάσω is practically always preceded by a preparticle, often vá "that." This is the form mentioned by Dzardzanos in his footnote. Yet historically χάσω or γράψω without νά are the successors of the aorist subjunctive of classical Greek, so that lovers of pure morphology are induced to call these forms "subjunctives," even though the term is used at the same time for the full forms too: νά χάσω, νά γράψω (so, e.g., Triantaphyllidis, 1941: 8 844, Dzardzanos, 1946: \$ 195 ff., Mirambel, 1949:124, 1959:153, Householder et alii, 1964:107, 125). This would imply that the appearance or non-appearance of νά is of no great consequence, and indeed we know that the "subjunctives" χάσω and χάνω can be preceded by other particles: ἄν "if," ἄμα "once," ὅταν "when" etc. (Mirambel, 1949:124 note, 1959:153), so that vá would seem dispensable. The present stem would thus also possess a subjunctive when preceded by those vá, av etc. The form of this present subjunctive has to be seen, as it were, through or under the identical form of the indicative.

Now this way of positing modal forms will be revealed as nothing but wishful thinking once we try to proceed from the other direction, i.e., from the present tense. Keeping sober, we see clearly that in a form $\nu\alpha$ $\chi\alpha\nu\omega$ "I should lose, that I lose" it is $\nu\alpha$ that is responsible for its "subjunctivity," since $\chi\alpha\nu\omega$ by itself is no more than indicative: "I lose." In the same way, $\alpha\mu\alpha$ $\chi\alpha\nu\omega$ "once I lose" or $\alpha\nu$ $\chi\alpha\nu\omega$ "if I lose," get their subordination from $\alpha\mu\alpha$, $\alpha\nu$.

The "proper" verbal form remains indicative, neutral.

Applying this conclusion now to the "aorist subjunctive" we get: $\nu \acute{\alpha} \chi \acute{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ contains the modal particle $\nu \acute{\alpha}$, responsible for "subjunctivity." What remains is simply an aorist-aspect stem with present indicative endings, that is, an indicative present tense carrying a perfective aspect!

By positing this notion, ² an aoristic-aspect present, we put ourselves into a quarrel with most of Greek grammatical tradition (cf. below, § 5). Yet we get satisfaction from the fact that in this way we can fill one empty case in tables like that of Dzardzanos (1946:§ 170) which, a little simplified, stands as follows:

		TIME		
	past	present		future
imperfective	ἔ γραφα	γράφω	θá	γράφω
perfective	ἔ γραψα		ðá	γράψω
	εζχα γράψει		θá	ἔχω γράψει
perfectic	ἔχω γράψει			

Similar lacunar tables are to be found in Mirambel, 1959:140, Babiniotis-Kondos, 1967:148. Our aoristic present naturally comes in at
the central empty case (the lower empty case I hope to discuss elsewhere).

What remains to be reckoned with is the fact that the aoristic present indicative $\chi \acute{a}\sigma \omega$ is limited in distribution: it practically never appears without a preparticle. Most of these particles are subordinative ($\ddot{a}\mu \alpha$, $\ddot{a}\nu$, $\ddot{o}\tau \alpha \nu$, $\nu \acute{a}$ etc.) so that this present tense is most frequent in subordinate clauses. This fact has its historical explanation in that the ancient aorist subjunctive, father of the modern aoristic present indicative, had nearly the same distribution. More important, this limitation has its synchronic justification too:

a perfective (aoristic) present in the indicative tends to have a future, not present, reference. Since the future role is filled by $\vartheta \alpha'$ + present (either perfective or imperfective), the aoristic present $\chi \alpha' \alpha \omega'$ has been almost wholly confined (within main clauses) to true modal forms like volitive $\nu \alpha'$ $\chi \alpha' \alpha \omega'$ and exhortative $\alpha' \zeta \chi \alpha' \alpha \omega'$ (besides, of course, its figuring in the aoristic future $\vartheta \alpha' \chi \alpha' \alpha \omega'$) where its futurity is suitable. On the other hand, in dependent clauses it follows particles like $\alpha' \mu \alpha'$, $\alpha' \alpha'$, $\nu \alpha'$ and $\delta' \tau \alpha \nu$ (below, § 3) and has an indefinite, general non-past reference (as opposed to the future proper in $\delta' \tau \alpha \nu$ $\vartheta \alpha'$ $\chi \alpha' \alpha \omega'$ and the like, which refer to an exact time-point in the future).

The future reference of the perfective present reminds one of the situation of the Russian or Bulgarian perfective verbs: what morphologically should have been their present tense serves as a future, so that they possess only the past and the future tenses. 4 Actually, the few instances of the Modern Greek unparticled aoristic present cited in the grammars have plain, indicative future reference: ἴσως ἔρθει "perhaps he will come" etc. 5 Cf. Dzardzanos, 1946: § 196. See below, § 4.8, for negation of such futures. See also in Kazantzakis' Zorbas 338 καί πού φύγει φύγει "Whoever can escape, will escape."

2. Converters

The term *conversion*, not unknown to traditional grammars, has been used again, e.g., by Benveniste (1958:41) as well as before him by Sweet (1900:\\$ 105) for the "conversion of the parts of speech." In his *Etudes de syntaxe copte* Polotsky considered the ability to "convertir une phrase en nom" (1944:56) as the essence of the relative clause. Then in his "Coptic Conjugation System" (1960:\\$ 10) he suggested the term *sentence converter* for three or four Coptic morphemes that, when prefixed to clauses—verbal, existential (1960:\\$ 33) or nominal (1960:\\$ 28)—cause different kinds of subordination,

i.e., turn the clause into an adverbial clause, an adjectival clause or a substantival one. Apart from its specific roles in Coptic, converter is now used by Professor Polotsky for any device, syntactic (e.g., subordinative conjunctions) or morphological (e.g., prefixes, suffixes) effecting substantivization, adjectivization or adverbialization, for example, the formants of verbal nouns, verbal adjectives or gerunds of all kinds. The Coptic "clause conjugations" (Polotsky, 1960:§ 4B) he now considers as "converted tenses" too.

But in Coptic the converters have additional, morphologic features. Specifically, in a verbal clause they are prefixed directly to the verb and in one conjugation they also "convert" the pronominal actor paradigm into another. The new verbal forms thus created are partly responsible for the great number of Coptic "tenses." This preverbal position of the converters can lead to a certain misunderstanding. Seeing that the great bulk of Polotsky's article (1960) was dedicated to converters in verbal clauses (the fact that the converters precede nominal and other clauses too was only briefly stated) and that Polotsky himself, in spite of his term sentence converter, was led many times to speak of "converting the tense" rather than converting the sentence or clause, 7 we can understand why many students of Coptic seem to believe that the converters are verbal morphemes in the same right as time, aspect or mood formants. In my opinion, the agglutination of the Coptic converters to the verb must be considered a juncture "accident" caused no doubt by the position prépondérante (Polotsky, 1976:2) of the verb in the verbal clause. It is just one more morphological complication to be overcome on the way to syntactic description.

A similar state is met with in Turkish, which has two kinds of verbal suffixes: time-mood formants like -di, -acak, -miş—although agglutinative and reiterable—are not transposing converters (in this they resemble Coptic preterital ne). That role (among finite verb suffixes) belongs to conditional -se and to gerundial -iken alone

(non-finite forms may be said to contain other converters, e.g., nom-inalizing -dik).

In the present paper, whose concern is the Modern Greek verb, I shall use converter only in its narrower sense: a verbal preparticle causing transposition (subordination) of the whole clause into a clause-part.

3. Modern Greek Converters

Many difficulties in the Modern Greek verbal system, e.g., the failure to establish a perfective present tense as suggested above (§ 1), center around the preparticles ϑd , $\mathring a \varsigma$, υd , $\mathring a \upsilon$ etc. The reason for the difficulties is that the morphologically oriented Hellenist or Indo-Europeanist likes to assign the main function to the finite verb-word, leaving the particles accessory roles. Yet in the Greek verb these are not accessory at all. Some of them are syntactic converters (subordinators) in the sense of Turkish conditional -se or Coptic circumstantial e-, while others are tense or mood formants with no subordinative quality, but expounding central categories of the verbal system. Things are most complicated with the Janus-faced particles $\mu \acute{\eta}$, $\upsilon \acute{\alpha}$ and $\mathring{\alpha} \varsigma$, that in one environment—subordinate clauses—are converters, while in another—main clauses 8—they serve as mood (e.g., volitive, exhortative etc.) formants.

All preparticles form an integral part of the verbal form: they are prefixed to the verb-word, with only the negation or the enclitic object-pronouns allowed after the prefix. Their morphological indispensability is best seen with the aoristic present $\chi \acute{a}\sigma \omega$ that, as mentioned above (§ 1), rarely stands without a preparticle.

Thus this tense may serve to distinguish between such preparticles and some adverbial particles ($\delta \alpha$, $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \omega \varsigma$), real subordinative conjunctions (not converters: $\delta \tau \iota$, $\pi \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, $\pi \circ \dot{\upsilon}$, $\dot{\epsilon} \upsilon \tilde{\omega}$, $\gamma \iota \alpha \tau \dot{\iota}$ etc.) and prepositions ($\dot{\alpha} \upsilon \tau \dot{\iota}$, $\gamma \iota \dot{\alpha}$, $\delta \dot{\iota} \chi \omega \varsigma$ etc.): all these do not suffice to "sustain" the aoristic present, so that another particle, mostly $\upsilon \dot{\alpha}$,

is needed.

One grammar is aware of the similarity in distribution between tense-mood formants and converters (which it calls conjunctions):

Le subjonctif [= aoristic present indicative, N. B.] peut fonctionner sans être précédé de $v\alpha$, car it peut être introduit simplement par des conjonctions, telles, par exemple, que $\alpha\mu\alpha$ (. .), $\pi\rho\iota(v)$ (. . .) etc. (Mirambel, 1959:153; but cf. also Babiniotis-Kondos, 1967:175 for $\iota(\sigma\omega\varsigma)$.

Yet is it true that, as Mirambel implies, all preparticles constitute a single form-class, with mutual substitution? The answer is no, as examples with more than one particle show: $\delta \tau \alpha \nu \delta \dot{\alpha} \chi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, $\delta \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\alpha$

Ná, ắς, μή are members of two form-classes at the same time. That means they represent, in main clauses (and in πού clauses, n.8), the tense-mood formant list, while in subordinate (converted, not conjunctional) clauses they are converters. It means too that, like all members of more than one form-class, they are incompatible with other members of either list: both 'ἄμα νά χάσω' and 'νά θά χάσω' do not occur, the same as 'νά ἄς χάσω'.

There are only two seeming kinds of exceptions to this incompatibility:

- a. We do find σά νά χάνω (or σά νά χάσω; cf. Zorbas, p. 107 Εἶναι σά νά μαδήσεις ἕνα παγόνι.), πρίν νά χάσω and προτοῦ νά χάσω, with both σά and νά, πρίν and νά, προτοῦ and νά. The reason for this is that in such cases σά, πρίν and προτοῦ are prepositions governing a substantivized νά clause; they are not converters as in σά χάσω, πρίν χάσω, προτοῦ χάσω.
- b. Νά μή χάσω occurs in spite of νά and μή appearing in the same
 form-class. But then μή in νά μή χάσω is a conditioned (obligatory)

CONVERTERS In dependent (converted) clauses only.			TENSE-MOOD FORMANTS	NEGATIONS
CIRCUMSTANTIAL	άμα			
	μόλις			
	ὄταν			
	πρίν			
	προτοῦ			
	σάν			
	ώς		1. In all clauses	
	ὄπως		θά FUTURE TENSE	δέ
	ὄσο			
	άφοῦ			
	ŏπου "wherever	11		
CONDITIONAL	αν			
RELATIVE	ὄποιος, -α, -ο			
	ŏ, τι			
	όσος, -η, -ο			
	οπου "whoever"			
	που "whoever"			
SUBSTANTIVIZER after verbs of fearing (§4.4)				
			 In main clauses or in dependent clauses introduced by a conjunction (πού, cf. n. 8). 	
SUBORDINATOR (substantivizing condition etc.)		νά	VOLITIVE-DELIBERATIVE-POTENTIAL	μή
CONCESSIVE		~S	EXHORTATIVE MOOD	(§ 4.1)
"LEST, OR" (§	4.3)	μή	NEGATIVE IMPERATIVE MOOD (§ 4.2)	none

form of the negation (§ 4.1), $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ being excluded by both $v\dot{\alpha}$ and $\ddot{\alpha}\varsigma$. It is the $\mu\dot{\eta}$ contained in the table under NEGATIONS, not the $\mu\dot{\eta}$ figuring with $v\dot{\alpha}$, $\ddot{\alpha}\varsigma$ (see further § 4).

The circumstantial converters are well known and need no examples. A few instances of the rest follow (all drawn from Kazantzakis' Zorbas).

3.1 Relative Converters

οποιος: Zorbas 125 Όποιος τή βρεῖ, πέντε ὀκάδες κρασί βρετίκια. "Whoever finds it, a reward of five okas of wine."

"Ο,τι: Zorbas 39 "Οταν τά συλλογίζουμαι, μοῦ 'ρχεται νά σπάσω ὅ,τι βρῶ μπροστά μου. "When I think of it, I feel like breaking anything I find before me."

οπου: Zorbas 309 "Οπου προφτάσει, ας πάρει! 'Whoever comes first, let him take it!"

πού: Zorbas 338 καί πού φύγει φύγει. "And whoever escapes, escapes."

3.2 Ná Converter

In subordinate clauses $v\alpha$ is a manifold converter, introducing mainly substantive clauses, purpose or conditional clauses. Its most frequent uses as substantivizer may be divided into two:

- a. Object-clause converter, including indirect statements and commands, e.g., Zorbas 7 πεθύμησα νά γράψω "I wanted to write"; 9 τόν ἄκουγα νά μοῦ μιλάει γιά τό χωριό του, "I heard him speaking to me about his village"; 10 ὅ,τι ἡ ἀνωτάτη παραφροσύνη μοῦ φώναζε νά κάμω "whatever the sublime insanity was calling me to do," etc.
- b. Substantivized clauses as subject or predicative of other ("nominal") clause types, e.g., *Zorbas* 17 Καλύτερα νά κόβεις μέ τό μαχαίρι "It is better for you to cut it with a knife." Etc.

For conditional and purposive $v\alpha$ as well as for its other uses as converter, see Dzardzanos, 1963:181 ff., Householder et al., 1964: § 5.23 (7).

3.3 Concessive Converters: as, xi as.

In subordinate clauses ας and μι ας are concessive converters. With the aoristic present only μι ας examples were found in Zorbas, e.g., 181 θά σοῦ τόν φανερώσω, μι ας πάει χαμένος "I am going to tell it to you, even if it doesn't do any good." With past tenses ας is common: Zorbas 98 "Ολα, ὅλα τά καταλάβαινε, ας ήταν καί χαχόλος "He understood everything, everything, even though he was a Ukrainian."

3.4 Tense and Mood Formants

- a. Main clause uses of νά + verb-form, the only ones deservedly called modal forms, have a modal (i.e., subjective, non-indicative) 10 sense—volitive, deliberative or potential, 8 according to environment: Zorbas 16 'Ο θεός νά βάλει τό χέρι του! "Let God extend his hand!"; 28 Νά καθίσω; "Shall I sit down?"; 9 Τί νά πεῖ ἔνας "διανο-ούμενος" σ' ἔνα δράκο; "What can an intellectual say to a dragon?" b. Main clause uses of ἄς (which may be called exhortative or precative mood formant): Zorbas 125 "Ας εἶναι καλά ἡ χήρα "Blessed be the widow."
- c. Most uses of θά "future," e.g., Zorbas 22 θά τό πάρω, εἶπα πεισματωμένος "'I am going to take it,' I said stubbornly."
- d. Main clause uses of $\mu\eta$ with the second person of the present tenses, to form negative imperative (§ 4.2).

4. Negations

In his footnote, Dzardzanos (1964:280, cited above, § 1), wishing to prove the separate existence of the subjunctive mood in a morphological form, invoked "the different use of the negation in each mood." A similar statement appears in Mirambel, 1959:151. Now this is another myth that wants disproving. The truth of the matter is that $\mu\eta$ has at least six different uses (see also Warburton, 1970:88 ff.), none of them attributable to the "subjunctive" $\chi\alpha\sigma\omega$ as such.

4.1 The most frequent use of $\mu\eta$ is as a negative, conditioned by

the presence of either $v\alpha$ or $\alpha\varsigma$ —where $\delta \varepsilon$ is excluded—in both main and dependent clauses. It is clear that what selects $\mu\eta$ rather than $\delta \varepsilon$ is the particle, not the alleged subjunctive following it, since any construction at all that includes $v\alpha$ or $\alpha\varsigma$ ($v\alpha$ $\varepsilon\chi\alpha\sigma\alpha$, $\alpha\varsigma$ $\varepsilon\chi\alpha\nu\alpha$ etc.) equally demands $\mu\eta$. The high frequency of this particle is due to the fact that $v\alpha$ especially is responsible for an enormous number of nominalizations (mainly as objects to verbs or to prepositions like $\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\gamma\nu\alpha$, $\alpha\nu\tau$ etc.). All these are negated by $\mu\eta$.

- 4.2 Μή without νά or ἄς in main clauses. This μή, e.g., μή γράφεις, μή γράφεις (or γράφης, γράψης in puristic orthography) is a mood formant in its own right, making a negative imperative μή γράφεις out of a simple indicative γράφεις: Zorbas 76 Μή θυμώνεις, 'Αφεντικό. "Don't get angry, sir."
- 4.3 Mή, this time in dependent clauses, is a converter introducing a special kind of final clauses that can be translated "lest" or simply "or": Zorbas 314 Πίσω, σᾶς λέω, μή σηκώσω τή μαγκούρα! "Get back, I tell you, or I raise my stick!"; 56 Μίλα, ἀφεντικό, μίλα, μήν παλαβώσω! "Speak up, boss, speak up or I shall go crazy!"

These μή clauses contrast with final νά μή ones—where the converter is νά, μή being an obligatory negation (4.1)—meaning "so as not or simply "not to Zorbas 20 Μάχουμουν νά μή βλέπω, νά μήν ἀκούω καί νά κρατήσω ἀκόμα τ' ὄραμα πού χάνουνταν "I was fighting not to see, not to hear and to keep the vision that went on fading."

4.4 Again in dependent clauses, but only after verbs of fearing, μή is a (positive!) converter introducing the object clause, but not negating it. It is merely a substantivizing converter selected in this special environment rather than νά. The negation is by δέ: Zorbas 20 'Ο φίλος μου φοβήθηκε μήν παραφάνηκε ἡ ταραχή του. "My friend was afraid that his agitation was too obvious"; 94 Φοβόμουν μήν ξαφνικά ἀπό τήν τόση φόρα δέ βαστάξει τό γέρικο κορμί του "I was afraid that suddenly, because of too much impetus, his old body would

not hold."

- 4.5 Like μήπως, μή can introduce a yes-or-no question. It is a question morpheme in this case, not bound to any kind of clause and is neither a converter nor a tense formant. It has no negative meaning: Zorbas 331 Μήν τά κακάρωσε ὁ κακομούρης; συλλογύστηκα. "'Is the poor fellow dead?' I thought."
- 4.6 Mή negates the participle: Zorbas 348 Έκλεισα πάλι τά μάτια, μήν μπορώντας ν' ἀντισταθῶ. "I again closed my eyes, unable to resist."
- 4.7 What is even harder for the theory of μή negating the famous "subjunctive" is that this very form χάσω (which I consider indicative) is in many environments negated by δέ. All clauses converted by ἄμα, ἄν, ὅποιος and all futures ("θά + subjunctive" according to Dzardzanos, 1946: § 176 note β'; § 182 note α') are so negated: Zorbas 354 Κι ἄμα δέν κόψεις τό σπάγγο "Once you don't cut the rope 52 "Αν δέν τό ταΐσεις θά σέ παρατήσει μεσόστρατα, "If you don't feed it, it will leave you in the middle of the road,"; 221 ὅποιος δέ γλιτώσει ἀλύμονό του! "Whoever does not get rid, woe to him!"; 39 δέ θά τό ξεχάσω "I shall not forget it."
- 4.8 But the coup de grâce to the alleged connection between $\mu\eta$ and the "subjunctive" is found in those rare instances where the perfective present indicative stands with no preparticle. These pure "subjunctives" are negated by $\delta \acute{\epsilon}$: "Ep $\vartheta\eta$ $\delta \acute{\epsilon} \nu$ $\rlap/\epsilon p \vartheta\eta$ $\rlap/\delta n$ $\rlap/\epsilon \tau pos$, $\rlap/\epsilon \mu \epsilon \Gamma s$ $\rlap/\delta n$ $\rlap/\epsilon n$ \rlap/ϵ

5. Critique and Typology

Of the two main conclusions arrived at in this paper—the existence of an aoristic present indicative $\chi\acute{a}\sigma\omega$ and the semimorphological status of the converters $\bar{a}\nu$, $\bar{o}\tau\alpha\nu$ etc.—each has been hinted at by some writer, but none has received the discussion it merits.

5.1 The aoristic present, as "subjunctive," was discussed time and

again by Triantaphyllidis, 1941: \$ 844; Dzardzanos, 1946: \$ 195 ff.; Mirambel, 1949:124, 1959:153; Pring, 1950:76 ff.; Babiniotis-Kondos, 1967:175 ff. Only Koutsoudas (1962:23, and again in Householder, Kazazis & Koutsoudas, 1964:104 ff.) posited γράψω as perfective nonpast indicative, which is rather close to our view here. Unfortunately, this glimpse of systemic truth suffered from some serious shortcomings: in 1962 the term perfective non-past seems no more than the identification, in $\gamma \rho \alpha \psi \omega$, of the -s- as "perfective" (or aoristic) stem-marker, and of -o as "non-past" ending. 11 These were mainly morphological instructions, not a systemic status. And indeed in 1962 Koutsoudas did not even say what mood he considered γράψω. Only in 1964 did he go as far as including this form under indicative, but, perhaps because that book was meant to be practical, he immediately fell back on "subjunctive" for both χάνω and χάσω when preceded by νά (Householder et al., 1964:105 ff.) and never developed his previous idea. The same goes for Irene Warburton's work, apparently much influenced by the former book but generatively cast (and at places rather badly edited, so that it is hard to draw conclusions from it).

Almost all contributions mentioned posit χάνω, χάσω, ἔχανα, ἔχανα, ἔχασα as basic forms. Strangely, the most sophisticated treatments (Koutsoudas, 1962; Babiniotis, 1972) do not even go beyond these, as if there were no compound tenses (future, perfect etc.) in Modern Greek. Others, more traditional or more practical, add the "modes et temps dérivés" to the basic forms. In my view, all suffer from the traditional, morphologistic tendency of looking for verbal categories inside the verb-word, while in the modern language it is exactly the case that some such categories moved to the prefixed particles. Functionally and formally, compound tenses (as long as they are recognized as tenses) belong in the verbal system in the same right as the simple ones and all need to be described together in order to ascertain the structure of the verbal system. Thus the only true modal forms of the Modern Greek verb, i.e., those that carry subjective, modal meaning,

are the ones prefixed by $\nu \alpha$, $\alpha \varsigma$ or $\mu \eta$ (in main clauses), that is, compound mood forms.

5.2 As for the special semimorphological status of the Greek converters (αν, ὅταν, ὅποιος etc.), here again it was the almost general confusion of χάσω ("subjunctive") with νά χάσω (again "subjunctive") that prevented linguists from seeing right. As we have said, χάσω is an indicative limited, in main clauses, to compound tenses with μή (negative imperative), νά (volitive, potential), ἄς (exhortative) and θά (future). In subordinate clauses it comes in only in "converted," i.e., substantivized, relativized, conditional, causal and temporal verb forms νά χάσω, ὅποιος χάσει, ἄν χάσω, ἀφοῦ χάσω, ἄμα χάσω etc. Only one grammarian mentioned that νά, ἄς or θά can be replaced, before the "subjunctive," by "conjonctions" (Mirambel, 1949:124 note; 1959:153). Others seem so exclusively preoccupied by νά, ἄς and θά, as the only particles that are really "verbal," and so sure of their "verbs" and their "conjunctions"—each group having nothing to do with the other—that they forgot to note this strange phenomenon: verb forms containing in themselves their subordination.

Typologically, these built-in subordinatives bring Modern Greek, at least in part, into the company of some highly agglutinative languages like Turkish or Coptic. I think it is very instructive for a Hellenist or an Indo-Europeanist to become aware of this unexpected turn in the behavior of such a well-known, well-mannered creature, the Greek language.

NOTES

* This article is based in part on some results drawn from a research project called "Syntax, Morphology and Lexicon of Modern Greek: Preparation of a Computerized Concordance in those Domains for One Text." The text, Zorbas by N. Kazantzakis, was punched on cards and conserved on a magnetic tape thanks to a grant by the Israel National Academy of Sciences, Commission for Basic Research. The present conclusions are the result of a check of all instances of the "verbal particles" in the text as retrieved by the computer.

Seiler (1968:104) speaks against the terms perfective, imperfective for the verbal aspects of the aorist and present respectively. For him (1969:130) the presentic aspect marks the starting point and the process of the action, while the aoristic aspect is unmarked, although in context it can well be said to convey point-aspect or better, the mere statement of the action as a fact. I fully accept Seiler's opinion (incidentally, Babiniotis' [1972:31] claim that it is the presentic aspect that is unmarked seems wholly without grounds). Yet I shall use perfective - imperfective here, as they are convenient and convey rather closely Seiler's idea, as long as we remember that the aorist is unmarked.

As for the term present, many would oppose this, suggesting non-past, neuter or the like. Here I have retained present, for I wish to stress the equivalence between $\chi\acute{a}\sigma\omega$ and $\chi\acute{a}\nu\omega$. I am willing to call them both non-past.

- I am grateful to my student, born in Salonica, Mr. I. Benmayor, for oral discussions that helped bring this conclusion about.
- The future θά χάσω after a particle (ὅταν, ἄμα etc.) seems always to refer to an exact point in time. It is thus the marked member. The aoristic present, however, like the imperfective present, can refer either to general circumstances or to a certain point in time. It is the unmarked member of the pair:

όταν + future - exact future time point: Zorbas 256 "Εχε τό νοῦ σου, Κουμπάρε, τό λοιπόν, <u>όταν θά φωνάξω</u>, "βίρα! βίρα!" νά μᾶς περάσεις τά δαχτυλίδια. "Be ready, best man, when I cry out 'vira! vira!, to put the rings on." Cf. Zorbas 84, 95, 261, 330 etc.

όταν + present - mostly general: Zorbas 25 Όταν μέ σφίξουν οἱ φτώχειες, γυρίζω τούς καφενέδες καί παίζω σαντούρι. "When poverty chokes me, I make the round of the cafés and play the santouri." Cf. 171 etc.

αμα + future - exact point: Zorbas 76 "Αμα θά πεθάνω ἐγώ, ὅλα θά πεθαίνουν. "The moment I die, everything begins to die." Cf. 223 etc.

ἄμα + present - mostly general: Zorbas 27 Αμα μοῦ πεῖ ἐμένα ἡ γυναίκα μου περίσσιο λόγο, τί καρδιά θές νά χω νά παίξω σαντούρι; "Whenever my wife says to me a word which is uncalled for, do you want me to be in a mood to play santouri?" Cf. also 13, but also 366 Αμα πεθάνω, γράψε του πώς "When I die, write to him that ." Cf. 101 etc.

σά + future - exact point: Zorbas 236 Θά 'ρθει κι ἡ σειρά τους,
Μά σά θά γίνω ἑβδομήντα χρονῶν. "Their turn will come too
Just when I become seventy."

- σά + present mostly general: Zorbas 128 Σά βραδιάσει, γυρίζω σπίτι, τρώγω ενα σκουτέλι φαί, πίνω κρασάκι, ἄν έχει. "As evening comes, I come back home, eat some food and drink a little wine, if there is some." Cf. 64 etc.
- The situation in Bulgarian, so similar to that in Modern Greek, was brought to my attention by my colleagues, Bo-Lennart Eklund and Rolf Hesse (personal communications), after reading the draft of this paper. Incidentally, their view of the "subjunctive" is rather close to the one put forth here (Eklund, 1976), but it was too late for me to incorporate it in this paper.
- 5 Grammars mostly cite one more form, πᾶμε "let's go!", as an "aorist subjunctive" that can stand with no particle (cf. Dzardzanos, 1946:§ 198.1 note). Yet πάω can be a regular present too, with πᾶμε, like φεύγουμε, γυρίζουμε etc., a first person plural of a present imperative.
- In 1960:§ 10 Polotsky posited three converters: preterital ne-, circumstantial e-, relative et-, ete-, e-, ent-. The Second Tense morphemes he considered similar to but not identical with the converters. Later (forthcoming:§ 2.0) he decided to use converter just for the morphemes susceptible of "transposing" the clause into a clause-part: circumstantial e-, relative et- etc. and the nominalizers (Second Tense morphemes), leaving preterital ne- out. In what follows I shall stick to this recent formulation conveyed to me, among some other stimulating views, some of which I briefly refer to in the present section, in a talk I had with Professor Polotsky on June 25, 1978.
- Even the second tense (= nominalizing) converter e-, naturally not appearing before nominal clauses, does not transpose just the verbal idea into a substantive. It acts on most of the verbal clause, including the actor, turning it into a substantive equivalent. In principle, only one adverb stays out of this conversion, and acts as predicate (comment, rheme).
- This statement has a necessary modification: clauses introduced by real subordinative conjunctions, i.e., non-converter subordinators (= which cannot "maintain" perfective presents) are counted as main clauses, because in them it is the conjunction that subordinates, while the particle is modal. In a check of two such conjunctions, πού and πώς, it was found that πού does introduce clauses with verbs in the νά-mood, mostly with a potential or volitive meaning (no such examples after πώς): Zorbas 19 "Αν ἕνας ἀπό τούς δυό μας βρεθεῖ σέ κίντυνο θανάτου, νά στοχαστεῖ τόν ἄλλο μέ τόσην ἕνταση πού νά τόν εἰδοποιήσει, ὅπου κι ἄν βρίσκεται

"If one of the two of us finds himself in danger for his life, let him think about the other with such intensity that he might inform him, wherever he is ."; 177 'Αγαπημένε δάσκαλε, ἐλπίζω νά λάβεις τό γράμμα μου ἐτοῦτο, πού ἴσως νά 'ναι καί τό στερνό μου. "Dear teacher, I hope you receive this letter of mine, which may perhaps be my last one." See also 30, 127, 135, 154, 167, 225, 260, 268, 288, 309, 320.

- It is interesting to note that in Zorbas, Kazantzakis used the construction with νά only in certain parts of the text, to the exclusion of the other possibility: Zorbas 55 πρίν νά φάω—all other πρίν cases, before or after p. 55, are either prepositions (153 πρίν τῆς ὥρας) or are constructed directly with the perfective present. Then there are four instances of πρί νά, grouped on pages 215, 216, 226, 232, whereas πρίν is used up to 172, then again from 296 on. An even neater distribution is found with προτοῦ: by itself, as converter, on pp. 30, 88. Then προτοῦ νά on pp. 174, 227, 357. It seems as if the writer was under the influence of different "fashions" in successive parts of the book. It all goes to prove further that πρίν, πρίν νά or προτοῦ, προτοῦ νά are equivalent elements, limited to different periods in the book (in different people each may be specific to a certain idiolect).
- The traditional name subjunctivus (Greek ὑποταμτική) is an example of the usual practice in our traditional grammatical terminology: it is a name for one of the typical functions of that verb form (e.g., λύωμεν), namely, its appearance in hypotactic, dependent clauses. The name was then generalized from the syntactic function of the form to the form λύωμεν itself, and it now covers its mainclause uses too. These are truly MODAL uses, expressing subjective attitudes of the speaker, and have nothing to do with hypotactics (or with sub-iungere).

On the other hand, optativus (Greek εὐχετική) as a term is due to the main-clause uses of a form λύοιμεν, expressing a (subjective, modal) wish. Then the name has come to designate the verbal form itself, with its other uses (mainly in dependent clauses) which do not express a wish at all. Incidentally, the same generalization has taken place with case names (e.g., dativus), which make sense for one syntactical environment but are meaningless in other constructions. Theoretically, the same form with a different meaning constitutes a different sign; since meanings are hard to distinguish and depend on environments, we may use environment for differentiating these signs: a "dative form" or a "subjunctive form" in one environment is to me a linguistic sign different from the same form in another environment. That is why I insist on referring to forms by $v\acute{a}$ $\chi\acute{a}v\omega$, $a\~{c}$ $\chi\acute{a}\sigma\omega$ etc., reserving the "modal" names volitive, exhortative for their main-clause uses. Their dependent-

clause uses will be designated, if need be, by object clause, final clause etc.

For an inconsistency in Koutsoudas' treatment of this form see Seiler, 1968:101.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andriotis, N., 1934 "Ύπάρχει ὑποταχτική στή νέα Ἑλληνική;" <u>Νέα Ἑστία</u> τόμ. 15ος, τεῦχ. 178.

Babiniotis, G. D., 1972

Τό ρημα της Ἑλληνικης (Athens).

Babiniotis, G. D. and P. Kondos, 1967 Συγχρονική γραμματική τῆς νέας Ἑλληνικῆς (Athens).

Benveniste, E., 1958 "La phrase relative, problème de syntaxe générale," Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris 53, 39-54.

Dzardzanos, A. A., 1934 "Καί ὄμως ὑπάρχει (ὑποτακτική)," Νέα Ἑστία 15.179.

Dzardzanos, A. A., 1946, 1963
Νεοελληνική σύνταξις, 2 volumes (Athens).

Eklund, B.-L., 1976

Verbal Aspect and Compound Nouns (Acta R. Societatis Scient. et Litter. Gothoburgensis, Humaniora 11; Göteborg).

Householder, F. W., K. Kazazis and A.Koutsoudas, 1964
Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki (The Hague).

Koutsoudas, A., 1962

Verb Morphology of Modern Greek (International Journal of American Linguistics 28.4, part II; Bloomington).

Mirambel, A., 1949

Grammaire du grec moderne (Paris).

Mirambel, A., 1959

La langue grecque moderne, description et analyse (Paris).

Polotsky, H. J., 1960
"The Coptic Conjugation System," Orientalia 29, 392-422.

Polotsky, H. J., 1976
"Les transpositions du verbe en égyptien classique," *Israel*Oriental Studies 6, 1-50.

- Polotsky, H. J., forthcoming Grundlagen des koptischen Satzbaus.
- Pring, J. T., 1950
 A Grammar of Modern Greek on a Phonetic Basis (London).
- Seiler, H., 1968
 Review of A. Koutsoudas, Verb Morphology of Modern Greek in Cahiers F. de Saussure 24, 99-104.
- Seiler, H., 1969 "Zur Problematik des Verbalaspekts," Cahiers F. de Saussure 26 (mélanges H. Frei) 119-35.
- Sweet, H., 1900

 A New English Grammar (Oxford).
- Triantaphyllidis, M., 1941 Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (τῆς δημοτικῆς) (Athens).
- Warburton, I., 1970

 On the Verb in Modern Greek (Language Science Monographs 4;

 Bloomington The Hague).